

Pg #1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Orlando Acosta & Edward Lloyd, et al.,

vs.

Democrat C. of Comm.tee, Enr. to  
Society, Elaine Tomko, et al.,

CIVIL ACTION NO.

2:17-CV-01462  
(Hon. Judge Slomsky)

Answer To Defendants 2<sup>nd</sup> Requested Motin of Dismissal

Plaintiffs, Orlando Acosta and Edward Lloyd, Pro-se.

① Plaintiffs 2<sup>nd</sup> Response To Dismiss case No. 2:17 cv. 01462  
Plaintiffs reply To Defendants Motin as follows

A. Orlando Acosta and Edward Lloyd Answer To Defendants question why did plaintiffs not get remedy through State Court. (All evidence will be produced in court)

④ Edward Lloyd was a candidate for State Representative placed #No. 1 on The Ballot in The 2014 Election in The 197<sup>th</sup> District. And he was challenged due to signatures. Mr. Lloyd bought 12-15 voters that were challenged to State Court and proved they were legal registered voters but the Judge still removed Mr. Lloyd starting going in 250-300 more in less than 2 hours. Mr. Lloyd believed he wouldn't get remedy in state court due to previous Ruling in state court. (Be advised Leslie Acosta was opposed)

③ Edward Lloyd ran against Leslie Acosta as a write-in candidate for State Representative Seat (re-election) in 2016 when

pg-#2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Orlando Acosta & Edward Lloyd, et al.,

vs.  
Democratic C. of Comm. Bee, Enr. to  
Sgoey, Elaine Connor, et al.,

CIVIL ACTION NO.

2:17-CV-01462  
(Hon. Judge Slosky)

Answer To Defendants' 2<sup>nd</sup> Reversed Mot. of Dismissal

① cont. Leslie Acosta was found to have pled guilty to 1 count of Embezzlement, Fraud and Money Laundering, and Mr. Lloyd received over 50 votes as a write-in candidate. The most of all the write-in candidates that ran against her. But the Democratic Party still seated her until she officially resigned on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2017 due to her guilty plea. Ed Lloyd should have been declared winner due to having the most votes.

② Mr. Lloyd ran again in the Special Election and he reported to the State Department, City Committee, Committee of 70, County Board of Elections, City Commissioners office, Attorney General's office, Governor's office, Speaker of the House, and Phila. Dist. Atty's office, as well as Philadelphia Police. And received no help in the complaint of the Special Election. That's why Edward Lloyd filed with federal law.

③ Orlando Acosta was a candidate in 2016 General Election as a write-in candidate against former State Representative Leslie Acosta, he received (3) three write-in votes. Leslie Acosta should have never been declared State Representative.

Pg #3 .  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Orlando Acosta & Edward Llyd, et al.,

CIVIL ACTION NO.

vs.

Commonwealth C. O. Comm. Bee, Enrico  
Sgoery, Elaine Tonkin, et al.,

2:17-CV-01462  
(Hon. Judge Slomsky)

Answer To Defendants 2<sup>nd</sup> Registered Motion of Dismissal

2<sup>nd</sup> cont. because under The State Constitution any Individual  
That is holding public office that has plead or found  
Guilty of Embezzlement of Public Funds cannot  
be Eligible To Run for or continue To Stay in Public  
Office under The Laws (State) of Pennsylvania Constitution  
Mr. Orlando Acosta challenged in Commonwealth Court and did not  
get Remedy. Then he was The only Write-In Candidate  
To appeal and Challenge Leslie Acosta <sup>during</sup> The General Election  
To Commonwealth Courts and still get Remedy. Both Courts  
stated They have no Jurisdiction of The Elections. That's  
why Orlando Acosta joined in with other Plaintiffs To  
file A Federal Lawsuit To seek Remedy in regards To  
197<sup>th</sup> District State Representative seat. Mr. Orlando Acosta  
contacted The District Attorney, Philadelphia Police Comm. Bee  
of PA, Department of State, County Board of Elections, speaker  
of The House, Mike Turzai, Governor Wolf's office, other State  
Representatives office, and City Commissioners To file complaints No Remedy,

#4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Orlando Acosta & Edward Lloyd, et al.,

vs.

Common C. O. Comm. Bee, Enrico  
Sgoeny, Elaine Tomlin, et al.,

CIVIL ACTION NO.

2:17-CV-01462  
(Hon. Judge Slomsky)

Answer To Defendants. A no Requested Motion of Dismissal  
was given To Mr. Acosta or any other Plaintiff.

3.) Plaintiffs also have knowledge That the Pennsylvania Attorney General and Philadelphia District Attorney's office is conducting a criminal investigation in regards to the Special Election 197<sup>th</sup> District and has been fully cooperatively with the Special Agents sharing Evidence <sup>Permitting</sup> with them. And this case should not be allowed to be dismissed due to the Evidence of Fraud, Corruption, Conspiracy that took place on Tuesday March 21<sup>st</sup> 2017 and prior surrounding the 197<sup>th</sup> District. All Evidence will be provided at the scheduled Court Hearing in September.

Respectfully Subscribed,

Orlando Acosta pro-se  
Edward Lloyd - pro-se  
Edward Lloyd pro-se